



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The

# American Historical Review

## THE MEETING OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION AT NEW ORLEANS

FOR some time it has seemed desirable to hold a meeting of the American Historical Association in the far south. The meetings that are held periodically at Washington are not inconvenient for the members living in the southeastern states, but from the beginning until 1903 no meeting was held in the southern part of the Mississippi Valley within easy reach of members from the south and southwest. The members in this region, it is true, are not many, but nevertheless a meeting that all could attend without trouble would, it was thought, bring together an unusual number and prove helpful to the scholars that are striving to arouse the Southern people to greater interest in history and to a greater appreciation of historical material and historical opportunity. The year 1903 seemed the appropriate time; a meeting at New Orleans would be a suitable recognition of the centennial anniversary of the acquisition of Louisiana. With these various considerations in mind, the Association determined to hold its nineteenth annual meeting at New Orleans. The sessions were held December 29, 30, and 31.

Although there were not in attendance so many Southern members as the most enthusiastic desired to see, there were enough to show the growing interest in historical work; and, while the value of the meeting cannot yet be weighed or measured, there is reason to believe that it gave new courage and zeal to historians and to historical students of the south—not only to teachers and students of history, but also to those who are engaged in gathering historical material and in preserving the manuscript records of the southern states. The number of members from other sections of the Union was not quite so large as at some of the recent meetings, but on

the other hand the attendance was very widely representative of all sections and states. Members were present from California and Arizona beyond the mountains, from Massachusetts and Connecticut in the northeast, from most of the other states of the Atlantic coast, and in unusual numbers from all parts of the Mississippi basin. A special train brought most of the members from the northeast. It started from New York and followed the line of the Southern Railway, offering an opportunity to visit Richmond, Atlanta, Mobile, and other places on the southward journey, and Chattanooga on the return trip. A special car, starting at Chicago for the convenience of the Northern members, stopped on the return trip at Vicksburg. In spite of some delays and the discomforts incident to crowded sleepers, these excursions seem to have been very successful and to have given general satisfaction.

The programme was so arranged as to have an occasional character. Two joint sessions were held with the Economic Association; at the first the regular annual addresses of the presidents were given; at the second the relation of sociology to economics and history was the subject of discussion. The papers of one session related chiefly to the Louisiana purchase; at another session the study and teaching of history in the south was discussed; at other sessions several papers were read bearing directly on the history of the south or the southwest. The only possible fault to be found with the programme was that there was too much of it; and this seems an ungrateful comment to pass on a scheme that was evidently the result of much hard work and serious planning by the members of the committee having the subject in charge. So far as the quality of the papers is concerned, the programme was one of the very best in the history of the Association. But the weary member who had traveled mayhap 1,500 or 2,000 miles to attend the meeting, who was desirous of seeing the sights of the old French city, and was even more anxious to exchange experiences with some fellow-worker whom he had not seen since the meeting at Philadelphia, was in a distracted state when confronted by an excellent programme filled with interesting and profitable papers and so arranged as to leave practically no free time outside of the three daily sessions.

In addition to the attractions of the programme must be mentioned the courteous attentions of the friends of the Association in New Orleans. The local committee of arrangements, of which Professor John R. Ficklen, of Tulane University, was chairman, left nothing undone to care for the comfort and pleasure of the guests. On the first day of the meeting, after a series of appro-

priate papers bearing on Louisiana history, the members were given a Creole luncheon by the Louisiana Historical Society. Wednesday noon a luncheon was served in the refectory of Tulane University, in the evening a smoker was given to men at the Round Table Club, and in the same afternoon Mrs. T. G. Richardson gave a reception especially intended for the lady members of the Association. The president and faculty of Tulane University received the members of the Association Thursday evening in the library of the university. On Friday morning the members of the Association were given a steamboat ride on the Mississippi, in the course of which they stopped to see the site of the battle of New Orleans and to visit a sugar plantation. At the point where Jackson beat back the British, short addresses were made by Professor J. B. McMaster and by the president of the Louisiana Historical Society, Professor Alcée Fortier. At the sugar plantation Professor Fortier spoke entertainingly of the beginning of the planting industry in Louisiana, of how sugar-cane gradually supplanted the indigo crop, and of the old plantation life before the war. The pleasure of the week was enhanced by the hospitality of the Round Table Club, the Athletic Club, and the Boston Club, which opened their club-houses to the use of the members of the Association.

A year ago, at the Philadelphia meeting, a number of persons who were members either of the Historical Association or of the Economic Association met and discussed the advisability of forming an association devoted to the study and discussion of topics in political science. It was then decided to take the matter under advisement and to give it serious consideration. A committee, appointed at Philadelphia to investigate the subject and gather opinions, reported at New Orleans in favor of establishing an organization not affiliated formally with either of the older associations. In accordance with that recommendation, a new society called the American Political Science Association was formed. Its purpose is to advance the study of politics, public law, administration, and diplomacy. There was a general feeling among the men who formed this association that their fields of work were so decidedly different from the fields of economics and history that only by the formation of a separate society could their topics receive proper attention and be sufficiently discussed.

The first session of the Historical Association was held under the auspices of the Louisiana Historical Society at the Cabildo, the picturesque and interesting *hôtel de ville* in the center of the old French quarter. The subjects under consideration all bore more or less directly on the Louisiana purchase. The first paper, by Professor

William M. Sloane, of Columbia University, is given in this number of the REVIEW, under the title "World Aspects of the Louisiana Purchase", presenting in a few words and in an interesting manner the epochal character of the movement and the treaty that gave to the United States the western half of the Mississippi basin. Hon. William Wirt Howe, of New Orleans, read a valuable paper on "The Civil and the Common Law in the Louisiana Purchase." When the colony was first settled, the law of France and the Custom of Paris prevailed, but with the Spaniards naturally came the Spanish system. In 1769 a small treatise containing rules of practice, some rules of criminal law, and directions in regard to wills was promulgated by Governor O'Reilly. From that time the laws of Spain really governed Louisiana; but they were in many respects similar in their origin to the laws of France, and the difference was scarcely perceived. After the cession to the United States, the Louisiana purchase was divided, one portion, about the present area of the state of Louisiana, being set off as the Territory of Orleans. Within these limits the old civil law as codified in 1808, largely along the lines of the Code Napoleon, continued to be fundamental, while in the rest of the purchase, which in 1812 became the Territory of Missouri, the common law of England was naturally introduced by immigration, and in 1816 was adopted by territorial statute as the rule of judicial decision. The two legal systems, however, are not now so diverse as formerly; technicalities have been gradually disappearing, and the elementary principles of right and justice are to-day much the same in all parts of the Louisiana purchase.

A paper on "New Orleans and the Aaron Burr Conspiracy" was read by Dr. Walter F. McCaleb. He referred to Burr's plan for revolutionizing the Spanish colonies; he recounted the formation of the "Mexican Association", the object of which was to obtain information regarding the forces and the internal condition of New Spain. The ordinary notion that the Creole resented the acquisition of Louisiana, Mr. McCaleb said, was altogether unfounded. He described how the idea gained currency that the Spaniards by threatening invasion would gain adherents among the people of New Orleans, and how Wilkinson, with characteristic effrontery and knavishness, announced that New Orleans was a hotbed of sedition and that Burr was plotting to disrupt the Union, and, while so professing, began to make military arrests and to rule the city with arrogance and injustice. Jefferson himself, under the influence of Wilkinson, came to believe that Burr was engaged in

treasonable undertakings, and that in New Orleans was centered his strength.

The paper of Dr. W. R. Shepherd, of Columbia, on "Louisiana in the Spanish Archives," was in a measure a plea for the examination of Spanish archives as sources of American history. Contrary to the commonly received opinions, the archives of Spain, Mr. Shepherd said, are more accessible than those of other European countries. The only requirements for admission are a good knowledge of Spanish and the proof that the investigator is a responsible person. The dispersion of the materials among several centers and an imperfect classification of the documents themselves are serious obstacles in the way of the investigator, and personal research is indispensable in practically all cases. The three great repositories that contain materials of importance for the history of the United States are those at Simancas, Madrid, and Seville. Among the papers at Simancas are many valuable sources for the study of United States history during the period of the Revolution, but many important documents of this time are to be found also in Madrid and Seville. As to the materials concerning Louisiana more specifically, the archives at Simancas and Madrid supplement each other, but the bulk of them is to be found in Madrid. Here also are the state papers properly so called as distinguished from the correspondence of the colonial officials with the Council of the Indies. This correspondence constitutes the wealth of the Archives of the Indies at Seville and hence are of special value for the internal history of Louisiana.

Reuben G. Thwaites, secretary and superintendent of the Wisconsin Historical Society, told the story of Lewis and Clark's journals. It is popularly supposed that the *Travels* edited by Nicholas Biddle and published at Philadelphia in 1814 are substantially the journals of the two explorers. But Mr. Thwaites showed that the original manuscripts of these journals amounted to over a million words, from which Biddle prepared a condensed popular narrative of 370,000. Practically all of the scientific matter was omitted, as Dr. Benjamin S. Barton had been engaged to make a separate volume of this, but he died without preparing his part. From 1816 to 1818 Thomas Jefferson spent much time in collecting the scattered note-books, which he deposited with the American Philosophical Society at Philadelphia, in trust for the public. In 1892-1893 Dr. Elliott Coues made several extracts from these manuscripts, as notes to his reprint edition of Biddle's work; but the manuscripts are, as a whole, as yet unpublished. Recently Mr. Thwaites unearthed in New York, among the Clark heirs, several

additional note-books by William Clark, together with a large mass of other data relative to the expedition. The story, as told by Mr. Thwaites, abounds in interesting details, some of them humorous, but others almost tragic in character.

On Tuesday evening a joint meeting of the two Associations was held at Newcomb Hall. President Edwin A. Alderman, of Tulane University, gave the address of welcome, in the course of which he spoke of the interesting and picturesque character of the history of the city, and of the fundamental tragic fact in the life of the South, the presence of the negro—the all-important economic fact of the present as of the past. For sixty years, he declared, the South stood ready to die and did die for the doctrine of state sovereignty, and to-day it would die for the doctrine of racial integrity: he deplored, however, the continued discussion of the race question—“the discussion has become a national disease and should be quarantined against, for it is getting hysterical and dangerous.” The speaker concluded that people who hold to high political doctrines which do not admit of compromise in their minds gain in a genius for intensity of conviction what they lose in liberalism, and that America needs the intense idealism of the South. Professor E. R. A. Seligman, president of the Economic Association, spoke on “Social Aspects of Economic Law.” He said that while everyone is aware that economics is a social science, the theory has received lip-service only and not brain homage. He asked real recognition of the social basis of economic law, and advocated serious application of sound social principle to the solution of the pressing problems of the day. “We are beginning to see”, he declared, in referring to the labor problem, “that the surest guaranty of liberty is the social sanction—that true and perfect freedom is at bottom the outgrowth of social forces, and that individual bargaining results in a mere empty husk of freedom.” The speaker dwelt chiefly on the need of a new study of taxation based on the existence of economic law and in accord with actual social facts and forces. “We shall then be able to prove”, he said, “that in order to secure justice we do not need to impose a tax which seeks equally to hit in the first instance every individual member of the community.” He argued, however, that the proper subordination of the individual does not mean his depreciation or the establishment of the crude socialism that is loudly proclaimed by some as the ideal policy of the future.

The address of Dr. Henry C. Lea, president of the Historical Association, was read by Professor Haskins, as Mr. Lea was unable to be present. It was published in the January number of the

REVIEW and therefore needs no long description here. The reader will remember that Mr. Lea in discussing ethical values in history pronounced as utterly fallacious the notion that there is an absolute and invariable code by which men of all ages and all degrees of civilization can be judged. Standards of right and justice, in part at least, are merely a social product changing with the passing years, and to judge a man's motives and acts by the rigid rule of to-day is to judge unjustly. The historian who would aspire to be a judge must not try a case by a code unknown to the defendant. Mr. Lea considered at some length the career of Philip II. of Spain, declaring that the student in earnest quest of truth may reasonably pause and ask himself whether Philip is to be held morally responsible for all his acts, whether he was a mere bloodthirsty tyrant, rejoicing in the suffering of others, or the conscientious but misguided agent of false standards, believing himself to be rendering the highest service to God. The address, therefore, advocated a calm recital of facts and conditions, the telling of the unadorned tale which because of its truth will not lose its claims as a teacher of the higher morality. The study of the past in this spirit may render us more impatient of the present and more hopeful of the future.

The Wednesday morning session was devoted to a conference on the study and teaching of history in the south. Professor W. E. Dodd, of Randolph-Macon College, spoke of the discouraging conditions in the south, where the teachers are underpaid, the school equipment is meager, and the pupils preparing for college have difficulty in getting proper instruction. He spoke of the rigidity of public opinion and of the fact that a large portion of the people are not accustomed to reading or the use of books. Under the circumstances strenuous effort must be made to awaken the people of the south, who love their own past and take pride in the achievements of their fathers, to an intelligent, sympathetic interest in history and history teaching in the schools and colleges. Professor Alcée Fortier spoke of the curriculum in the New Orleans schools, and referred to the work of the Louisiana Historical Society and to its collections. Miss Lilian W. Johnson, of the University of Tennessee, spoke principally of the work done in the schools and colleges of Tennessee, of the influence of the summer school at Knoxville, and of the spirit of progress that is discernible even though to the impatient the forward movement seems at times hopelessly slow. The difficulties of the situation are heightened by the fact that Tennessee has a debt, a reminder of the days of Reconstruction, and has, moreover, no school fund. The school system must be supported only by direct and immediate taxation.

Professor Frederick W. Moore, of Vanderbilt University, discussed the past rather than the present of historical study. He spoke of the conditions before the war, of the men who had been conspicuous teachers of history in the early days, and of the gradual improvement in recent years. Up to 1860 the north and south were not very unequal in their facilities for historical study; in both sections there was gradual improvement. In the next fifteen years the northern schools and colleges developed their curricula; in the south conditions grew worse. During the last twenty years there has been a rapid growth at the north and slow improvement at the south. Professor Franklin L. Riley, of the University of Mississippi, spoke of the work done in his state for the improvement of historical teaching and study, but dwelt chiefly on the founding of the Mississippi Historical Society and the establishment of the department of archives and history in the state government. Professor David Y. Thomas, of Hendrix College, commented briefly on the situation in Arkansas. Mr. Thomas M. Owen, who is in charge of the newly-created department of archives and history of the state of Alabama, gave a statement of the aid that is now given by the southern states for the preservation, collection, and publication of their records and other historical material. Scarcely any states in the Union are doing as much as are Alabama and Mississippi, where the state governments have established departments charged with the task of gathering and preserving valuable historical papers. Most of the other southern states do not give much direct financial support to historical undertakings, though some of them have made appropriations for the publication of materials. In Texas a small appropriation has been made for the classification and translation of early Texas manuscripts, while the historical association without material financial encouragement from the state has been courageously undertaking the enormous task of bringing together the old records and miscellaneous papers bearing on the early history of the southwest. Professor J. Franklin Jameson, of the University of Chicago, commented briefly on the condition of historical study and teaching in the south, saying that there is every reason to be encouraged by the undoubted evidences of advancement, reminding his hearers that but a few years ago the East had accomplished but little and that the West still faces many of the problems that now confront the South. A single and, if need be, a self-sacrificing devotion to the cause of history, he said, is the surest mode of removing the obstacles to progress. The paper of Professor Lucy M. Salmon, of Vassar, was not intended to have peculiar bearing on the problems of the Southern teacher. She

discussed in a most entertaining and suggestive manner the problem of cultivating by historical study the pupil's power of observation. Opportunity for developing this faculty is everywhere abundant and open to every discerning and intelligent teacher. Historical occurrences as well as human aspirations are plainly presented in the place-names of every region of America. The architecture of every land, too, is a solid, permanent record of its stages of civilization and its different phases of human thought; thus, to the observant student of history the evanescent and ephemeral spirit of the passing centuries is seen firmly fastened in the stone, brick, and mortar of private dwellings and public edifices.

The afternoon session of Wednesday was taken up with three papers on European history. Professor F. M. Fling, of the University of Nebraska, read a paper entitled "Louis XVI., Machault, and Maurepas", in which he examined the commonly accepted tradition that the king began the series of unfortunate acts that led to his execution by selecting as his adviser the frivolous Maurepas in place of the upright and sober Machault. According to the common story, he had originally decided upon Machault, but, yielding to the influence of his aunt Adelaide, he recalled the messenger and substituted Maurepas for Machault on the envelope. The tradition, Professor Fling declared, is a mere legend, against the probability of which can be cited, not only written evidence, but the historical setting and circumstances of the time. Maurepas was the man that would naturally be chosen as adviser; Machault was an impossibility. The next paper was on "Sermons as a Source of Medieval History", by Professor C. H. Haskins, of Harvard, which will be printed in a succeeding number of the REVIEW. It dwelt chiefly on the sermons preached at Paris in the thirteenth century, which contain much valuable material for the history of medieval culture. They throw light on the every-day life of the time and especially upon university conditions, touching upon various aspects of academic methods and procedure, the character of the studies pursued, and the nature of the examinations. Dr. H. A. Sill, of Cornell University, next spoke on "Plato in Practical Politics." Plato's political theories, Dr. Sill maintained, were intended to lead to practical results. He had purposed in early life to enter public service; the *Republic* was offered as a concrete programme of attainable reform; its more polemical portions were directed against imperialistic democracy as well as against the Tyrannies represented by Dionysius of Syracuse. On the death of Dionysius, Plato was called by the party of reform to Syracuse to give aid in the establishment of a constitutional monarchy and in

freeing the communities subject to Syracuse. The attempt failed, but he still clung to the hope of affecting the policy of the younger Dionysius. He took no active part in the revolution, which resulted in nothing but confusion. *The Laws*, written near the end of Plato's life and designed to present his theories in a form adapted to actual existing conditions, was evidently composed in a spirit of resignation, bearing witness nevertheless to his undying hope that his ideals might find ultimate realization.

The session of Wednesday evening, the third session of a day filled with good papers and interesting discussions, was devoted to diplomatic history. Professor F. J. Turner, of the University of Wisconsin, read the first paper, which was a valuable summary statement of the relations of Spain, England, and France in the Mississippi basin from 1789 to 1803. In an article which will be printed in an early number of the REVIEW Professor Turner will consider the subject in a somewhat different form and with more detail. It is necessary, therefore, only to say here that the paper dwelt on the significance of the Louisiana purchase, which gave to the United States the undeniable control of the Mississippi basin, and put an end to a long system of intriguing and plotting which had occupied France, Spain, and England for so many years; it recounted briefly the efforts of Spain to secure the western country, the later ambition of France, and the hope of England. The chief value of the paper lies in the fact that it traces in broad outline through the administrations of Washington and Adams the course of diplomatic history; for in the twenty years succeeding the Revolution, as throughout the war itself, diplomatic effort and diplomatic difficulty were intimately associated with the great problem of the west, with American expansion and the occupation of the Mississippi valley, for the possession of which France and England had already fought a long and exhausting war. The paper read by Professor George P. Garrison, of the University of Texas, on the annexation of Texas, will also be published in the REVIEW. The reader will see that though the title is an old one, the treatment is new, that the whole is an important study largely based on hitherto unused documents. Possibly the statement that will attract most attention is that the annexation movement was not brought into being or at first stimulated by pro-slavery influences; that it was the natural product of American growth, of American expansive spirit. The student who has read Western history to any purpose will probably be easily convinced by Professor Garrison's assertions. Dr. Jesse S. Reeves gave an interesting account of the events leading up to the treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo. He told of the

appointment of Trist as commissioner for this critical negotiation. Trist was a clerk in the State Department, devoid of diplomatic experience and without the diplomatic temperament, but he was thought to be amply qualified to bring to an end Polk's "little war", which was intended to be a lesson to the Mexicans and to furnish an opportunity to get much land as an indemnity for a little trouble. The idea of sending a peace commissioner to accompany the army and seek a favorable opportunity for proposing peace was a very unusual procedure, which may be explained by the coincidence that Santa Anna, having been permitted by Polk to pass into Mexico, had barely arrived at the capital when Polk's overture for peace reached him. Trist succeeded in getting into sundry difficulties with General Scott, in giving untold annoyance to Polk, who wanted California without too much fighting and without any commotion, and finally, in making a treaty, after he was recalled, which was in exact conformity with the letter of his original instructions—a unique and amusing episode in diplomatic history. His correspondence leads one to believe that he did this because he thought that Polk now wanted all of Mexico and that he could throw on Polk the odium of making excessive demands and annihilating Mexico. A generation after these events, this petulant diplomat, who had disregarded the orders of his superior and made a treaty which turned over an empire to his country, was paid by Congress for his successful if forbidden services.

The day's programme was brought to an end by an entertaining talk by Dr. Clarence W. Bowen, who spoke of a collection of valuable manuscripts in his possession—the correspondence and diaries of Baron von Closen of Count de Rochambeau's staff. The papers furnish important material for the study of the social conditions and military incidents of the Revolution. By the use of a stereopticon some of the more interesting letters and a number of original drawings by von Closen were exhibited, among the drawings being a sketch of Martha Washington by Alexander Hamilton.

At the Thursday morning session, which, like all the sessions of the previous day, was held at Tulane University, papers in the general field of American history were read. The paper by Professor Max Farrand, of Leland Stanford, which we have the privilege of publishing in this number of the REVIEW, was the first on the programme. In an interesting paper on the Constitutional Convention of 1864 in Louisiana, Professor John R. Ficklen, of Tulane University, described the effort to form a constitution, the problems that were presented to the convention, and especially the difficulty of dealing with negro suffrage. Peculiar interest attaches to the

convention because it was one of the earliest attempts to restore a seceded state to its place in the Union; because it shows what Union men within the Federal lines were willing to do for the negro; because the reconvening of this convention in 1866 is properly regarded as the proximate cause of the severity of Congressional Reconstruction in the south; and lastly, because the scheme devised for the reconstruction of Louisiana was entirely the work of Abraham Lincoln. The result of the convention's work was a constitution containing every provision desired by General Banks, and otherwise mainly a revised edition of the constitution of 1852. It favored the abolition of slavery, and provided for public schools for colored and white children, but did not extend suffrage to the negroes. The convention lasted seventy-eight days, adopted a constitution filling ten pages, and spent during its deliberations \$125,000, of which \$791 was for goblets and wine-glasses, and \$9,421.55 was for liquors and cigars. The next paper on the programme was by Hon. Peter J. Hamilton, of Mobile. It gave an outline of the history of West Florida from 1763 to 1781. The last paper of the morning was on "Popular Sovereignty and the Development of the West", by Professor Allen Johnson, of Iowa College. The paper was substantially a study of Stephen A. Douglas and the Kansas-Nebraska Act. The argument was in brief as follows: Neither Douglas nor any other statesman invented the doctrine of "squatter sovereignty". The right of the people to regulate their own domestic concerns was already a part of the political creed of Western democracy. Douglas, always an advocate of territorial expansion, sought to give it wider application in the new territories. He is not, therefore, to be regarded as a tool of the slave power. The Kansas-Nebraska Act was the outcome of repeated efforts through ten years to secure the organization of the Territory of Nebraska. His chief concern was the development of the farther west, so that our Pacific possessions might be brought into vital connection with the commonwealths of the Mississippi valley. The Kansas-Nebraska Act was not planned before the thirty-third Congress as a political coup. Douglas believed that by repealing the Missouri Compromise in favor of the principle of "popular sovereignty" he was making an apparent but not an actual concession to the South. He did not expect that even Kansas would become slave territory.

The last session of the Association was held in connection with the Economic Association, the subject of discussion being the relation of sociology to history and economics. There was much sober statement, considerable assertion, and a good deal of amiable recrimi-

nation. The debate was not without interest, but the residuum of conviction was negligible. The sociologists complained that history is unscientific, if not meaningless. The historian answered that facts are facts, even if sound generalizations are not drawn from them, and they denounced the modern notion that knowledge is not knowledge if it is not obtained, classified, and labeled according to the demands of the student of physical science. The sociologists, the historian suggested, may draw as many conclusions as they see fit and torture facts to suit as many hypotheses as they choose, but they ought not to be deluded into the supposition that their work is historical. The opening paper was by Professor F. H. Giddings, of Columbia, who said that he conceives of sociology as a study of the general forms of social phenomena, and the general causes operative in society; while statistics, history, and ethnography are studies of concrete social relations or occurrences in the present, the recorded past, and the unrecorded development of man before history, properly so called, begins. He developed at some length his conception of sociology as a theory of social causation. Those philosophies of history that are metaphysical were set aside as practically valueless, and those materialistic theories, like Montesquieu's and Buckle's, which try to explain social changes in terms of the direct action of the physical environment upon the human mind, were likewise inadequate. The real key to the explanation of social evolution is found in those characteristics of the physical environment which determine the ethnic and the psychological composition of a population through the processes of migration, including emigration and immigration. In conclusion the speaker called attention to some of the relations of this composition of a people to the possibilities of liberalism and democracy in their social organization. Professor Giddings was followed by Professor Albion W. Small, of the University of Chicago, who contended that the historians, in spite of all their rejoicing over a new era, have not as yet found the social viewpoint. They spend all their time in indexing dreary, profitless details about inconsequential folk, in developing their technical skill for the discovery of insignificant objects, in learning so much about how to investigate that they have forgotten what is worth investigation. Professor Charles H. Cooley, of the University of Michigan, in discussing the paper, said that there are three ways of thinking about the nature of history as regards cause and effect, *viz.*, the materialistic, the idealistic, and the organic, that of these the last was the right way, and that it had not been sufficiently emphasized by the speaker. Professor George L. Burr, of Cornell, in a very interesting criticism of Professor Giddings's asser-

tions, contended that the grievance of which Professor Giddings complained is only that the word history has never meant what he would now make it mean. The theme of history has indeed been, not generalizations, but the lives and deeds of individuals—individual men, individual peoples, individual states, individual civilizations; its method has been, not biologic, but biographic; its prime aim, however obscured now and then by the prepossessions, theologic or sociologic, of the historian, has always been, in the simple phrase of Ranke, to learn and to tell *wie es eigentlich gewesen ist*. History may possibly not be scientific. It is not the sciences alone that have a right to their names and to their fields. If history is not a science of society, it is more; it is society, it is travel, acquaintance, experience, life. Professor Willis M. West, of the University of Minnesota, in his comments on the paper, remarked on the readiness of the sociologists to rush in where historians decline to spin cobwebs. The historian, in close touch with complex facts, denies the possibility of capping social life with a formula. The sociologist, with commendable confidence, calls out, "Then bring me your facts and I will tell you what they mean." But there will be no such quaint division of labor. So far as history can be explained, the historian means to explain it himself; and he feels as competent to do so as anyone can be who does not study it. The remarks of Professor Emerton, of Harvard, were in substantial accord with the arguments of the other historians. "I cannot help thinking", he said in conclusion, "that under the seductive name of sociology we are here meeting once more the ghost of our ancient enemy, the philosophy of history. I am far from denying that there is a great variety of human facts that can be studied in themselves and in their manifold relations with much profit to our day, and in so far as it is the work of sociologists to gather and marshal these facts in usable form, it is worth while to enrich our vocabulary by this one more word of classification. But if sociology is to spend its energies in concocting schemes of philosophy to explain the past and in ever so slight a degree to predict the future, then the sooner it is resolved into its constituent parts and dropped from the schedules of our institutions of learning, the better." Dr. Lester F. Ward, of the Smithsonian Institution, said that the difference between sociology and history is that sociology is science, while history is not. Sociology is based on a train of causation; history on a train of facts. History he declared to be an agreeable occupation and a pleasant pastime.

The business meeting of the Association, which was held Thursday afternoon, was as usual not the least interesting of the sessions.

Dr. James Ford Rhodes presided. The corresponding secretary, Professor Haskins, gave the report of the Council, spoke generally of the business that had been transacted, and said that the Council had decided that in the future the members of the Association should be consulted more generally than in the past concerning the election of officers, and that blanks would be sent out, upon which members might suggest their choices for officers and make any other suggestions concerning the work of the Association. Following a recommendation of the Council, the Association voted to discontinue the Church History Section; the reason for this step is simply that the work of the Association is so broad and inclusive that there is no need of separating church history and distinguishing it from other fields of historical study. This action was in accord with a report made by a committee composed of Professor Samuel Macauley Jackson, Professor George P. Fisher, and Professor William A. Dunning, who had been asked by the Council in 1902 to get the opinions of members interested in church history, consider the question of the continuance of the section, and investigate the advisability of taking such action. Dr. Bowen, the treasurer, in giving his report for the year, was enabled to say that in spite of increasing expenses, the funds of the Association had grown during the year. The total receipts were \$7,204.02 and the net gain \$736.49. The number of members on the rolls last year was 2,070. The assets of the Association now amount to something over \$21,000.

The most interesting and significant new departure was the establishment of a Pacific Coast Branch of the Association. The constitution of this new organization and the terms of its relationship to the general organization are simple. Members of the American Historical Association residing in states wholly or in part west of the Rocky Mountains may, if they so desire, be enrolled as members of the Pacific Branch; other persons desiring membership may become members, if approved by the executive committee, by paying the ordinary dues to the treasurer of the general Association. The president of the Pacific Branch or a delegate is entitled to attend the meetings of the Executive Council of the American Historical Association, from whose treasury is to be paid a reasonable sum for clerical expenses of the yearly meetings of the Pacific Branch. An account of these meetings and the papers deemed suitable for inclusion in the *Reports* of the Association are entitled to be printed.

Professor E. G. Bourne, chairman of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, in reporting on its work, called attention to the recent publication of the Chase Papers. In the near future the commission

will present for printing the despatches of the French ministers in this country between 1795 and 1798, something over 350,000 words in all, throwing much light on the diplomatic history of the period. They are to be edited by Professor F. J. Turner. In addition the commission has in contemplation the publication of documents bearing on the diplomatic history of the Republic of Texas, some 15,000 manuscript pages, opening up the important and interesting history of the relations of Texas with the United States, Great Britain, and France. The editorial work is in the hands of Professor George P. Garrison. The commission, Mr. Bourne reported, are planning to print and distribute a short set of rules or instructions for the transcription and publication of historical manuscripts. For the Public Archives Commission, its chairman, Professor Herman V. Ames, reported considerable progress during the past year. The field of investigation is now so extended that the commission is represented in nearly three-fourths of the states. It is expected that the publications of the Association for 1903 will contain reports from at least six states—Rhode Island, New Jersey, Virginia, Georgia, Texas, and Colorado. In addition to their other work, representatives of the commission have taken the initiative in securing legislation for the better supervision of the archives of Pennsylvania and have begun work for a similar purpose in New York. For the board of editors of the AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW Professor George B. Adams spoke chiefly of the fact that the office of the managing editor of the REVIEW is now in Washington. Professor A. C. McLaughlin, in supplementing the report of Professor Adams, gave a short statement concerning the relationship of the REVIEW to the Carnegie Institution, saying that while there is no definite agreement, the indefinite understanding is that the managing editor of the REVIEW will be the director of the Bureau of Historical Research established by the trustees of the Carnegie Institution. He also referred to the contemplated work of the Bureau of Research, reference to which is made on another page of this issue. The committee on the Justin Winsor Prize reported through its acting chairman, Professor Charles H. Hull, of Cornell, that the prize for the year 1903 had been awarded to Dr. Louise Phelps Kellogg, of Madison, Wisconsin, for a monograph on "The American Colonial Charter: a Study of its Relation to English Administration." Following the recommendation of the committee, the Association voted to offer a prize for the best essay on European history, the sum awarded to be charged to the Adams fund, and the prize to be called the Herbert Baxter Adams Prize. Resolutions were passed thanking the hosts of the Association in New Orleans for their courtesies.

The life and services of General Edward McCrady, who held at the time of his death the office of second vice-president in the Association, were appropriately recognized in resolutions of sorrow and respect. The Association voted to meet next year in Chicago and expressed its expectation of meeting in 1905 at Baltimore and Washington, and in 1906 at Providence. The committee on nominations, composed of Mr. Reuben G. Thwaites, Professor J. A. James, and Professor J. M. Vincent, proposed a list of officers, who were then chosen by the Association. Dr. Goldwin Smith was made president; Professor John Bach McMaster, first vice-president; Judge Simeon Eben Baldwin, second vice-president. Mr. A. Howard Clark, Professor Charles H. Haskins, and Dr. Clarence W. Bowen were once more elected to the positions they had previously held. To the Council were chosen Professor Edward G. Bourne and Professor Andrew C. McLaughlin in place of Professor J. Franklin Jameson and Professor A. Lawrence Lowell, who had served three years as members of the Council.

OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL  
ASSOCIATION.

<i>President,</i>	Goldwin Smith, Esq., Toronto, Canada.
<i>First Vice-president,</i>	Professor John Bach McMaster, Philadelphia.
<i>Second Vice-president,</i>	Judge Simeon Eben Baldwin, New Haven, Conn.
<i>Secretary,</i>	A. Howard Clark, Esq., Smithsonian Institution, Washington.
<i>Corresponding Secretary,</i>	Professor Charles H. Haskins, 15 Prescott Hall, Cambridge, Mass.
<i>Treasurer,</i>	Clarence Winthrop Bowen, Esq., 130 Fulton St., New York.
<i>Executive Council</i> (in addition to above named officers) :	
Hon. Andrew Dickson White, <sup>1</sup>	Captain Alfred Thayer Mahan, <sup>1</sup>
President James Burrill Angell, <sup>1</sup>	Henry Charles Lea, Esq., <sup>1</sup>
Henry Adams, Esq., <sup>1</sup>	Herbert Putnam, Esq.,
Hon. George Frisbie Hoar, <sup>1</sup>	Prof. Frederick Jackson Turner,
James Schouler, Esq., <sup>1</sup>	Professor George Lincoln Burr,
Professor George Park Fisher, <sup>1</sup>	Prof. Edward Potts Cheyney,
James Ford Rhodes, Esq., <sup>1</sup>	Prof. Edward Gaylord Bourne,
Charles Francis Adams, Esq., <sup>1</sup>	Prof. Andrew C. McLaughlin.

*Committees:*

*Finance Committee:* Elbridge T. Gerry, Esq., 261 Broadway, New York, chairman, George S. Bowdoin, Esq.

*Committee on Programme for the Twentieth Meeting:* Professor J. Franklin Jameson, University of Chicago, chairman, Professors Henry E. Bourne, Ralph C. H. Catterall, Charles H. Haskins, and Reuben G. Thwaites, Esq.

*Local Committee for the Twentieth Meeting:* Charles L. Hutchinson, Esq., Chicago, chairman, Edward E. Ayer, Esq., E. W. Blatchford, Esq., Edward O. Brown, Esq., James H. Eckels, Esq., Dr. James W. Fertig, Marshall Field, Esq., Charles F. Gunther, Esq., President William R. Harper, Dr. Franklin H. Head, H. N. Higinbotham, Esq., Professor James A. James, Professor J. Franklin Jameson, Professor Harry P. Judson, Elbridge G. Keith, Esq., Samuel H. Kerfoot, Jr., Esq., Hermann H. Kohlsaat, Esq., General J. B. Leake, Franklin MacVeagh, Esq., E. E. Prussing, Esq., Martin A. Ryerson, Esq., Dr. Otto L. Schmidt, Professor Francis W. Shepardson, Professor Edwin E. Sparks, Professor Benjamin S. Terry, Dr. James Westfall Thompson, and Dr. Joseph P. Warren (with power to add members at the discretion of the chairman).

*Committee on the Entertainment of Ladies at the Twentieth Meeting:* Mrs. Mary J. Wilmarth, Auditorium Annex, Chicago, chairman, Miss Sophonisba Preston Breckinridge, Miss Ida M. Tarbell (with power to add auxiliary members at the discretion of the chairman).

*Editors of The American Historical Review:* Professors Andrew C. McLaughlin, H. Morse Stephens, George B. Adams, J. Franklin Jameson, William M. Sloane, and Albert Bushnell Hart.

*Historical Manuscripts Commission:* Professor Edward G. Bourne, Yale University, chairman, Professor Frederick W. Moore, Professor Theodore C. Smith, Reuben G. Thwaites, Esq., Professor George P. Garrison, and Worthington C. Ford, Esq.

*Committee on the Justin Winsor Prize:* Professor Charles M. Andrews, Bryn Mawr College, chairman, Professors Edward P. Cheyney, Charles H. Hull, Williston Walker, and Roger Foster, Esq. (In Professor Andrews's absence during a portion of the year Professor Hull, Cornell University, will act as chairman of the committee.)

*Committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams Prize:* Professor Charles Gross, Harvard University, chairman, Professors George L. Burr, Victor Coffin, James Harvey Robinson, and John Martin Vincent.

*Public Archives Commission:* Professor Herman V. Ames, University of Pennsylvania, chairman, Professors William MacDonald, Herbert L. Osgood, Charles M. Andrews, and Edwin E. Sparks.

*Committee on Bibliography:* Ernest C. Richardson, Esq., Princeton University, chairman, A. P. C. Griffin, Esq., George Iles, Esq., William C. Lane, Esq., Reuben G. Thwaites, Esq., and Professor Max Farrand.

*Committee on Publications:* Professor George W. Knight, Ohio State University, chairman, A. Howard Clark, Esq., Professors Fred M. Fling, Samuel M. Jackson, Elizabeth K. Kendall, Anson D. Morse, and Earle W. Dow.

*General Committee:* Professor Henry E. Bourne, Western Reserve University, chairman, Professors Lucy M. Salmon, Lilian W. Johnson, George E. Howard, John S. Bassett, William MacDonald, George B. Adams, Charles H. Haskins, and Marshall S. Brown.